LIBRARY
29 JAN 1957
STATE LEGISLATURE, MADRAS

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 26th September 1956.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, at nine of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI N. GOPALA MENON) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Thiruvannoor Cotton Mill Strike

* 3 *Q.*—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there has been a strike in the Thiruvannoor Cotton Mill (Malabar Cotton and Spinning Mills), Kallai, Malabar, from September 11th, 1956;

(*b*) if so, the number of workers involved in the strike;

(*c*) the reason for it; and

(*d*) the conciliation measures taken by the Government to settle the issues which led to the strike?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: (*a*) Yes, Sir.

(*b*) About 700 workers.

(*c*) The strike is due to the failure of the parties to arrive at a settlement in the industrial dispute regarding gratuity, bonus, fixation of work load, etc.;

(*d*) The Assistant Commissioner of Labour held conciliation at Kozhikode and brought about a settlement on 18th September 1956. The strike has been called off on 19th September 1956.

* 4 *Q.*—SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received any representation from the Cotton Mill Workers' Union, Thiruvannoor, Kozhikode, Malabar, regarding their notification to strike work from 11th September 1956 onwards; and

(*b*) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: (*a*) Yes, Sir.

(*b*) The Assistant Commissioner of Labour held conciliation at Kozhikode and brought about a settlement on 18th September 1956. The strike has been called off on 19th September 1956.

[26th September 1956

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : May I know what is the attitude of the Government towards the demands of these workers to constitute an Arbitration Board for settling some of the issues which have not been included in the recent settlement?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, I do not know how that question arises. The workers have resumed work on 19th September 1956 in pursuance of the settlement which is on the following lines :—

(1) Gratuity scheme as indicated in the memorandum of settlement will be implemented.

(2) The Union withdraws claims for bonus for the years prior to 1955. As regards bonus for 1955, there is no agreement and the Union will be at liberty to raise this issue again before the proper authority.

(3) Management agrees to reinstate the workers retrenched in 1954 and 1955 as and vacancies arise as a result of the implementation of the gratuity scheme.

(4) Management agrees to take advantage of the subsidy scheme regarding housing as and when circumstances permit.

(5) No wages will be paid for the strike period.

(6) The parties agree to defer other demands till such time as negotiations between the Mill Owners' Association, Coimbatore, and the respective Unions are over.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : My point is this. There are certain demands which have been deferred by the workers also for the time being. I want to know the attitude of the Government to the demands of the workers with regard to the constitution of an Arbitration Board consisting of the representatives of the Government, the workers and the management to settle the disputes.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, the attitude of the Government with reference to disputes like these is first they would try conciliation; if it fails, they would try arbitration and if it also fails, they would set up the machinery for adjudication.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Sir, are the Government aware of the fact that before the strike, the management and the Union both agreed to an arbitration and it was referred to the Government, but the Government did not agree to arbitration. That is why the strike came. May I know why, when both the parties agreed to an arbitration, as the issues involved were important ones and had to be settled early, the Government failed to refer this for arbitration?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I have no information about this particular matter. But I may tell the hon. Member

26th September 1956]

that whenever both the parties concerned agree to arbitration the Government will not stand against it. Rather they would welcome it.

Alleged assault of certain persons by the Police in Coimbatore

* 225 *Q.*—Sri P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that one Ira. Rangaswami and two others S. C. Viswanathan and K. Marimuthu were taken to Vaisya Street Police station in Coimbatore at 2 a.m. on 30th July 1955 by two constables in mufti while they were fixing the wall posters issued by the Dravida Kazhagam in bamboo thattis, and kept in the Police lock-up till 3 p.m. on 1st August 1955;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that Mr. John Khan Sahib, Sub-Inspector of Police, indulged in abusive language against them and severely beat them causing bleeding injuries on their legs, hands, bodies, etc.;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that a doctor of the Headquarters Hospital, Coimbatore, examined them on their release from the Police lock-up, and issued wound certificates to them;

(*d*) whether any complaint was received from them by the Government; and

(*e*) whether any action was taken against the Police Officer, and, if so, what it was?

The Hon. Sri C. SUBRAMANIAM : (*a*) Yes, Sir. It is a fact that three persons Ramaswami, son of Rama Naicker, Viswanathan, son of Veerabhadra Naidu and Marimuthu, son of Ganesha Asari, were arrested at about 2 a.m. on 30th July 1955. They were remanded to custody by the Town Sub-Magistrate on the morning of the same day. As the 30th and 31st were holidays, the accused were kept confined in the Police lock-up as remand prisoners and taken to Court on 1st August 1955.

(*b*) No, Sir.

(*c*) Yes, Sir.

(*d*) No complaint was received by the Government. It has however been reported that Sri Viswanathan preferred a private complaint in Court. The Third City Magistrate, Coimbatore, inquired into the complaint under section 202, Criminal Procedure Code. He dismissed the complaint as he found that the allegations were baseless.

(*e*) Does not arise.

Sri P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : Sir, for what offence and under what circumstances these three persons were arrested and taken to police custody?

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS